



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,886	09/04/2003	Kimmo Laakkonen	915-006.021	1554

4955 7590 09/15/2008
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

WHIPPLE, BRIAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/656,886

Applicant(s)

LAAKKONEN, KIMMO

Examiner

Brian P. Whipple

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 14-18 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 14-18 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/27/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 14-18, and 21 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/27/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 8/27/08, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections of claims 1-2 and 4-6 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections of claims 1-2 and 4-6 have been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's remaining arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 14-18, and 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer et al. (Theimer), U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692, in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention, further in view of Skladman et al. (Skladman), U.S. Patent No. 7,181,495 B2, and further in view of Nale, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0074411 A1.

7. As to claim 1, Theimer discloses a method for controlling the handling of push type e-mails on a mobile terminal device (Abstract), comprising:

selecting a user profile (Col. 25, ln. 17-26) on the basis of automatically received position information of said mobile terminal device (Abstract; Col. 8, ln. 52-58; Col. 9, ln. 64 – Col. 10, ln. 7, “user’s context and environment, such as current location... user’s preferences may be dynamically changed by... changing the profile”; Col. 25, ln. 27-45), said

user profile regarding the handling of push type e-mails on said mobile terminal device (Col. 25, ln. 17-26, 46-51, and 55-57), wherein said selected user profile comprises push type e-mail enabled or push type e-mail disabled (Col. 25, ln. 46-51), and

controlling at said mobile terminal device (Col. 25, ln. 55-57; “a user may specify...”) the handling of push type e-mails according to said selected user profile (Col. 25, ln. 46-51).

Theimer discloses a user specifying preferences related to the delivery of messages (Col. 25, ln. 55-57) and a user profile (Fig. 3, item 102) depicting the wishes of the user (Col. 25, ln. 23-26) is examined by a UserAgent (Col. 25, ln. 21-23).

Additionally, Theimer discloses that the user’s preferences are stored in a user profile (Col. 9, ln. 54-55) and that the UserAgent is running “on some trusted computer or computers on the network” (Col. 9, ln. 49-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the user profile as being stored on the mobile terminal device, as the user profile is separate from the UserAgent as discussed above. Theimer fails to explicitly disclose where the user profile is stored, and therefore it would be natural to assume the profile is stored on the user’s mobile terminal device itself, as it is defined by the user and specifies the user’s preferences, and the UserAgent “may obtain information about the user from user profile 102 at startup time” (Col. 9, ln. 55-59) as opposed to stating that the user profile is integrated in the UserAgent as implied by the applicant’s remarks. Additionally, it is implied the user profile is separate from the

UserAgent, because when a user changes preferences the “changing of the profile file and alerting the userAgent” occur (Col. 10, ln. 3-7).

Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading Theimer, would have recognized the need to store the user profile in a system, especially given Theimer’s disclosure that the user’s preferences are stored (Col. 9, ln. 54-55). There are a finite number of systems in the teachings of Theimer that may be used to store the user profile. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to try storing the user profile at the mobile terminal device of the user, as a person with ordinary skill in the art has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp.

Theimer is silent on filtering said received e-mail according to a sender based filter characteristic selection, wherein the filter characteristics are defined in said user profile.

However, Skladman discloses filtering said received e-mail according to a sender based filter characteristic selection, wherein the filter characteristics are defined in said user profile (Fig. 5; Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Theimer and what was well known in the art by filtering said received e-mail according to a sender based filter characteristic selection,

wherein the filter characteristics are defined in said user profile as taught by Skladman in order to prevent unwanted or unneeded emails from being received by an end user.

Theimer may be interpreted as disclosing disabling push type e-mail by deactivating a software component required to receive push type e-mails in the mobile terminal device. Clearly, if the delivery of an e-mail is delayed, then at least code in the software components of the mobile terminal device of Theimer has resulted in temporary disabling of push type e-mail (since delivery is based on the user preferences as discussed above).

Though, for the sake of argument, the Examiner will assume Theimer and Skladman are silent on disabling push type e-mail by deactivating a software component required to receive push type e-mails in the device of Theimer and Skladman.

However, Nale discloses disabling push type e-mail by deactivating a software component required to receive push type e-mails in a device ([0075], ln. 32-38). The client, through the use of setting vacation hold start and stop dates, disables push type e-mails until a desired date.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Theimer, what was well known in the art, and Skladman by performing the afore-mentioned modifications as taught by Nale in order to allow a user to disable e-mail while on vacation.

8. As to claim 2, Theimer, what was well known in the art, Skladman, and Nale disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said controlling of the handling of push type e-mails comprises notifying a push type e-mail server of a mobile communication network about the handling of push type e-mails according to said determined user profile (Theimer: Fig. 1; Fig. 17; Col. 24, ln. 49-60).

9. As to claim 4, Theimer, what was well known in the art, Skladman, and Nale disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said user profile comprises a predetermined filter acting on the received push type e-mails (Theimer: Col. 25, ln. 23-26 and 52-57), said filter selecting push type e-mails according to properties of said received emails (Theimer: Col. 25, ln. 23-26 and 52-57), wherein said method further comprises:

receiving a push type e-mail (Theimer: Col. 25, ln. 6-12), and

filtering said received e-mail according to said properties (Theimer: Col. 25, ln. 23-26 and 46-57).

10. As to claim 5, Theimer, what was well known in the art, Skladman, and Nale disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 2, including storing said received push type e-mail (Theimer: Fig. 17, items 430, 432, and 436; Col. 25, ln. 46-51; it may be interpreted that

if the application waits for a change in context before reattempting delivery that it must store the e-mail until the reattempt)

11. As to claim 6, Theimer, what was well known in the art, Skladman, and Nale disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said terminal device further comprises sensors (Theimer: Fig. 1; Col. 12, ln. 62-66), said method further comprising:

determining of sensor data (Theimer: Fig. 1; Col. 12, ln. 62-66), and

changing said user profile according to said determined sensor data (Theimer: Fig. 1; Col. 9, ln. 64 – Col. 10, ln. 7; Col. 12, ln. 62-66; Col. 25, ln. 17-26).

12. As to claim 9, Theimer, what was well known in the art, Skladman, and Nale disclose a software tool comprising program code means stored on a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of claim 1 (Theimer: Col. 8, ln. 52-58; see the rejection of claim 1 above), when said software tool is run on a computer or network device (Theimer: Col. 8, ln. 52-58).

13. As to claims 14-15, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.

14. As to claim 16, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 4 above.

15. As to claim 17, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 2 above.
16. As to claim 18, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 6 above.
17. As to claim 21, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claims 1-2 above.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152
9/13/08

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2152